

**COMPARISON OF MISSION DESIGN
OPTIONS FOR MANNED MARS MISSIONS**

Gus R. Babb
William R. Stump
Eagle Engineering, Inc.
Houston, TX

ABSTRACT

A number of manned Mars mission types, propulsion systems, and operational techniques are compared. Conjunction and opposition class missions for cryogenic O_2/H_2 , hybrid (cryo/storable), and NERVA propulsion concepts are addressed. In addition, both Earth and Mars orbit aerobraking, direct entry of landers, hyperbolic rendezvous, and electric propulsion cases are examined. A common payload to Mars was used for all cases. The basic figure of merit used was weight in low Earth orbit (LEO) at mission initiation. This is roughly proportional to launch costs.

INTRODUCTION

There are many ways to design a manned Mars mission. The optimum design depends a great deal on the long and short-term goals of the program. These are at present officially undefined, but range from beating the Russians to Mars with a one landing program to permanent colonization. A program to carry large quantities of material to Mars over a long period of time will tend to settle on designs with minimum initial mass in LEO (includes vehicles and propellants) since Earth launch costs will eventually overwhelm development costs. A short term, one or two mission program, perhaps schedule driven, could concentrate on minimum development costs rather than minimizing LEO mass. The best design depends on the program. In the absence of clear direction, mission designers will produce designs that tend to fulfill their own personal view of what a manned Mars program should be. Since the authors of this paper favor a long-term program and would

(NASA-CR-188265) COMPARISON OF
MISSION DESIGN OPTIONS FOR MANNED
MARS MISSIONS (Eagle Engineering)

N94-70923

23 p

Unclass

like to see propulsion technology advance, minimum LEO mass is emphasized. Others may have different, but not incorrect views.

SCENARIOS

The basic scenario advanced in this paper is a Mars mission carrying two aerobraking landers/ascent stages of 62 metric tons total mass each, one Mission Module (MM), in which the crew lives, of 53 metric tons, and one Orbital Transfer Vehicle (Mars-OTV) of 31 metric tons. The spacecraft leaves a 500 km circular low Earth orbit, the basic Space Station orbit, and transfers to Mars. At Mars it deboosts into a 24 hr. ellipse (500 x 33,000 km) at the proper inclination so that perigee precesses to be lined up correctly for departure to Earth at the proper time. Once in Mars orbit, the two landers descend to the surface while the MM and propulsion stages remain in elliptical orbit. The Mars-OTV is used by the crew to rendezvous with and explore the two Martian moons. At the end of this surface exploration, the two ascent stages (one on each lander) launch to low Martian orbit where the Mars-OTV meets them and transfers crew and samples up to the MM. The ascent stages and the Mars-OTV are then discarded. The propulsion stage(s) then return the MM to a 24 hr. Earth ellipse (500 x 72,000 km) where it is met by an OTV from the Space Station.

MISSION TYPES

The above scenario was examined for a generic conjunction mission and opposition type Venus swingby mission for the years 1999, 2001, and 2005. In addition, an electric propulsion case and two hyperbolic rendezvous cases were included.

The conjunction mission uses a near Hohmann transfer from Earth to Mars, a one and one-half year wait at Mars for proper planetary phasing, and a near Hohmann transfer back to Earth. This is the minimum-energy mission with a total mission time of

approx. 1000 days and flight opportunities every two years. Delta-V requirements vary somewhat between mission opportunities, but remain constant enough so that a generic Delta-V budget can be constructed for planning purposes.

The Opposition missions require transfer to Mars, a stay time of 30 to 60 days, then a transfer back. Because of the phasing, non-Hohmann, high-energy transfers must be used. It has been found that a Venus swingby, either outbound or inbound, can substantially reduce the total energy requirements. Such a swing-by exists for virtually every mission opportunity every two years, but the variation in the three-body relationships creates large Delta-V variations between missions. Thus, each opportunity must be addressed as an entirely separate mission. These missions typically take around 700 days.

The electric thruster case gives high specific impulse (Isp) but very low thrust. For low thrust the system (unmanned) spirals out from LEO to some high orbit such as the L2 Lagrangian point. The crew is then transported to the spacecraft via an OTV flight from LEO. The manned Mars stack then spirals out to Mars and slowly spirals down to low Mars orbit. The landers are dispatched and when the phasing is suitable the process is reversed to return to Earth.

When the power supply is sufficiently large, this reduces to a conjunction type mission with spirals at both ends. The time at Mars including spiral down, orbit operations, and spiral back up becomes the year and a half Mars stay time of the conjunction missions. Electric thruster mission times vary from a minimum of 3 years upward depending on the power source. Practical manned missions will require one megawatt or more of electrical power.

The hyperbolic rendezvous concept requires a launch from Earth carrying the landers and a MM. When Mars is reached, the system does not deboost into Mars orbit; instead, the landers

separate and perform hyperbolic aerobraking entry maneuvers to landing sites while the Mission Module et. al. flies by Mars and is discarded. A second spacecraft with a second Mission Module leaves Earth at nearly the same time as the first spacecraft, but on a year and a half period trajectory that passes Mars 30 days after the first vehicle. The ascent stages that were landed from the first vehicle launch as the new MM passes by and perform hyperbolic rendezvous maneuvers with it. The crew must then ride the MM for one and a half orbits until it reintersects Earth. Mission time is three years, almost all of it in transit.

A modified version of this, the Hyperbolic exchange, assumes a continuing manned base on Mars. The original vehicle with MM and landers is launched into the one and one-half year orbit, passing Mars. As it passes Mars the landers separate and do a hyperbolic entry and landing, while, simultaneously, the crew that had landed on the previous mission two years before launches to a hyperbolic rendezvous with the MM for the orbit and one-half flight back to Earth. In effect, a crew exchange takes place. Total mission time for a crew with this scenario is at least 5 years.

Delta-V's for the various missions are given in Table 1.

PROPULSIVE SYSTEMS

Hybrid - The hybrid system was used as a baseline. It consists of cryogenic liquid oxygen-liquid hydrogen (LO_2/LH_2) stages for trans-Mars injection (TMI) and Mars orbit insertion (MOI) and a LO_2 /propane "space storable" stage for trans-Earth injection (TEI) and Earth orbit insertion (EOI). This eliminates the problem of storing liquid H_2 in the high heat environment of Mars planetary orbit, where additional cooling equipment to reduce propellant boiloff would be required.

All Cryogenic - This system used LO_2/LH_2 for all stages. This assumes that insulation and re-refrigeration are developed to allow long-term (2 to 3 year) H_2 storage.

Nerva - This nuclear rocket system uses nuclear engines with hydrogen as a reaction mass. Three engines of 75,000 lb. thrust each were used. All three are used for TMI to get the thrust/weight up to around .1 in order to keep gravity losses from being excessive. After TMI, one engine and all the empty hydrogen tanks are discarded. Engines 2 and 3 are used together to perform MOI. Engine 2 and the tanks emptied during MOI are then discarded. Engine 3 then performs TEI and EOI. Again, long-term hydrogen storage is required. This also assumes that the NERVA engines can be started, shut down, and restarted several times while still maintaining their 10 hour total thrusting lifetime.

Electric Propulsion - High power, low thrust, high I_{sp} ion engines are used for this system. I_{sp} 's from 3,000 to 20,000 seconds were examined, requiring power supply sizes from .2 to 6 megawatts. Though ion engines with nuclear electric power is a reasonably well-known case, any thruster and power processing system with specific mass in the 10 kg/kw range and primary power supply with specific mass as shown in Table 2 will provide equivalent performance. The stage characteristics and other parameters used are shown in Table 2. The electric propulsion design used only a single stage. The delta Vs shown in Table 1 for low thrust show the spiral out to L2, and a transfer to Mars vicinity summed together as TMI, a spiral in to Mars (MOI), and a spiral out from Mars and transfer to Earth-Moon L2 (TEI). The spent stage is left at L2, and the crew is transferred back to Earth with an OTV.

FLIGHT OPTIONS

The software built for this study allows us to stack any given mission (opposition, conjunction, etc.) with any propulsive

system and payload configuration and combine these with any of a large number of flight case options. These include:

- 0 All propulsive four stage operations
- 0 All propulsive three stage operations
- 0 All propulsive two stage operations
- 0 All propulsive one stage operations
- 0 Aerobraking at Mars--two stage
- 0 Aerobraking at Earth--one, two, or three stage
- 0 Aerobraking at Mars and Earth--two stage
(The above three aerobraking cases consider aerobrake weight as a percentage of braked cargo to be a variable parameter)
- 0 Separation of landers before MOI with the landers performing hyperbolic aero entry--three stage

The cases using aerobraking at Mars can reflect aerobraking to different Mars apoapses by simply changing the TEI delta V to reflect the lower ellipse.

RESULTS

The bulk of the study concentrated on the generic conjunction and the three opposition opportunities with three propulsion systems--hybrid, all-cryo, and NERVA. Figure 1 shows the mass required in LEO for each of these three propulsion systems applied to all four of the standard missions. These were all-propulsive cases, each carrying the same reference cargo set. This chart immediately yields the following results:

- 0 All-cryo does not yield substantially better performance than the more conservative hybrid case.
- 0 With chemical propulsion, the all propulsive opposition missions are significantly more expensive than the conjunction missions. Aerobraking reduces this disparity in cost.
- 0 The NERVA system shows a clear performance advantage for Mars planetary missions. This advantage becomes more and

more marked as the mission energy requirements go up. Consequently, the NERVA system could offer a reasonably practical option of flying some of the short stay opposition missions during the early phases of Mars exploration.

- O Provided multi-megawatt power supplies are available, electric propulsion is competitive with NERVA and high thrust conjunction class missions, but not as flexible.

Figure 2 shows the impact of discarding part of the MM before the EOI burn. Again, the impact is greater on the high energy missions. This is not generally a major impact but the savings in launch costs (at approx. \$1 million per metric ton) warrant examination of the reuse value of the MM parts.

Figure 3 shows the impact of aerobraking at Mars if the vehicle is aerobraked to the same 24 hr period ellipse as in the propulsive case. Various values of aerobrake mass as a percentage of mass to be carried are shown. Only the hybrid propulsion system was examined. The non-aerobraked references are shown as marks on the y-axis. These data show that the overall performance is relatively insensitive to the aerobrake mass in the range considered.

Aerobraking yields substantial gains: the greatest gains being shown for the outbound Venus swingby cases, where encounter (MOI) velocities at Mars are high. Aerobraking can bring some opposition missions down to a reasonable departure weight. (The problem encountered is high acceleration during braking and its effect on the crew.)

Figure 4 shows the impact of aerobraking as the apoapsis of the post-aerobrake orbit is reduced. For this comparison, only the conjunction and the 2005 opposition missions with hybrid propulsion were examined. The aerobrake weight used is 15% of the mass carried. Targeting an aerobrake to a very high apoapsis ellipse is difficult because the target velocity is so near

escape that even a relatively small aero-exit error could cause loss of the vehicle. The apoapsis may have to be targeted to as low as 2000 km (500 x 2000 km) to guarantee a safe capture.

Nearly all of the aerobraking advantage for the conjunction mission is lost if a low Mars orbit is used (because of the required delta V increase for TEI). However, the absolute change with apoapsis altitude is nearly constant for both missions so the 2005 opposition mission still shows a massive reduction from the all propulsive case.

Figure 5 shows aerobraking for different Mars apoapses, using a NERVA propulsion system. Again, the gains for the conjunction mission are minimal. The mass for the 2005 case is reduced by about a third; however, the potential advantage of aerobraking is not so great for the NERVA cases, which are already very efficient.

Figures 6, 7, and 8 show the sensitivity of the various missions to changes in lander weight (or cargo carried to Mars orbit and left). The three charts are for the three propulsion systems, hybrid, all-cryo and NERVA.

Figures 9, 10, and 11 show the sensitivity of the missions to Mission Module mass (or mass carried round trip). The results of these figures for all 12 combinations are summarized in Table 3 as equations of the form: Initial weight in LEO = $A + B \times (\text{Lander \& Mars-OTV Weight}) + C \times (\text{Mission Module Weight})$.

Figures 12 and 13 compare various aerobraking modes for the conjunction and the 2005 opposition cases with hybrid and NERVA propulsion. The most notable item is the relative effectiveness of releasing all landers pre-MOI and letting them aerobrake either to direct landing or to a low orbit to await landing site availability. Since the landers are designed for aero-entry already, it may prove relatively inexpensive to do this. Entry g levels may be high however.

Figure 14 shows the crew time, or the time the crew spends in the spacecraft from L2 departure to L2 return, versus power supply for the electric propulsion case. This defines the power requirement for each case since flight times should be kept below four years. Combined with Figure 15, which shows initial mass in LEO versus power, the two figures show that more than one megawatt of electric power will be needed. The lowest I_{sp} cases have short trip times for low power, but Figure 15 shows their LEO masses are approaching the NERVA (600 metric ton) and conventional chemical conjunction (1,000 metric ton) cases. One 3,000 second case with a reduced payload of one lander and no Mars-OTV might be performed with 600 kw. The low thrust cases must provide substantial LEO mass savings to offset the additional development costs; however, if large power supplies are developed separately, the low thrust opportunities will be highly competitive.

Figure 16 compares several aerobraking cases with the hyperbolic rendezvous schemes for hybrid propulsion. For this figure the Mars-OTV was removed from all cases to make a one-to-one comparison possible and the hyperbolic rendezvous landers were increased from 62 metric tons each to 90 metric tons (Ref. 1) each to account for the extra propellant required in the ascent stages to reach the hyperbolic outbound velocities. The hyperbolic case requires less mass than the opposition mission, but the comparison should be made with the conjunction missions since the total mission times are nearly the same (3 years). For hyperbolic rendezvous, nearly all the time is in interplanetary transfer, while for the conjunction missions, half of the time is at Mars. Hyperbolic rendezvous shows some weight advantage; however, nearly the same gain can be achieved in the conjunction case by simply staging the landers pre-MOI and doing a hyperbolic entry. This is much simpler than the hyperbolic landing and ascent required of the other case. Significant risk may be associated with the hyperbolic ascent and rendezvous.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Advanced technology propulsion should be pursued vigorously to support a long-term Mars program. Given the assumptions used in this paper, NERVA appears to yield an advantage even in the minimum energy cases and may provide the flexibility of flying the higher energy mission options. This advantage may become more pronounced as high energy missions to destinations past Mars are contemplated. This conclusion was also reached by workers of the late 60's (Ref. 2). Reference 2 documents the last large, overall systems level study done on a manned Mars mission/program on NASA contract.

The NERVA program, cancelled in 1970, was designed with a manned Mars mission in mind. However, there were several problems which are assumed solvable in this paper:

- O The old NERVA specific impulse estimate of 900 seconds was degraded to the 750 second region by erosion problems of the graphite core elements and by the propellant losses needed to cool the reactor after each burn. This paper assumes an Isp of 825 seconds.
- O The inert shielding mass was high. This paper assumes a shield and reactor mass of 11.5 metric tons per stage. Changes in this can significantly alter the results. Formidable problems for manned operations in the vicinity of NERVA also exist.
- O The low density of the hydrogen propellant (4.4 lbm/ft³) compared to O₂/H₂ (22-25 lbm/ft³) resulted in higher cost per unit for delivery.
- O No mission model large enough to absorb the development costs and still make the old NERVA program pay existed.
- O Environmental and political/emotional impact of testing were severe.

- O A "nuclear safe altitude" is not well defined. This paper assumed the NERVA could depart from a 500 km circular orbit. If this changes radically, the results may also change.

Aerobraking is worth continued investigation, particularly if no advanced space propulsion is available.

Conjunction class missions can be flown for reasonable weights even with chemical all-propulsive cases. However, either the NERVA or aerobraking are necessary to make the opposition missions a practical alternative.

Electric propulsion also offers weights in the NERVA range, but with less flexibility. Its feasibility hinges on the practicality and cost of megawatt level electric power supplies, which need to be determined.

REFERENCES

1. Stump, William R., Babb, Gus R., and Davis, Hubert P., Mars Lander Survey, Eagle Engineering Inc., Houston, Texas, NASA JSC Contract # NAS9-17317, presented at the Marshall Space Flight Center Mars Workshop, June 10-14, 1985, Huntsville, Alabama.
2. Integrated Manned Interplanetary Definition Study (IMIS), 1968, Boeing, Seattle, Contract No. NAS1-6674, 6 volumes.

TABLE 1
MISSION DELTA-V'S M/SEC

<u>MISSION TYPE</u>	<u>TMI</u>	<u>MOI</u>	<u>TEI</u>	<u>EOI</u>
Conjunction Generic	3,808	1,666	1,490	967
Opp. 1999 In-bound Swingby	4,489	2,757	1,628	3,725
Opp. 2001 In-bound Swingby	3,792	1,798	3,633	1,252
Opp. 2005 Out-bound Swingby	4,400	3,543	1,673	1,198
Low Thrust	13,300	2,600	8,300	0
Hyperbolic Rend. Launch	3,799	0	0	0
Hyperbolic Rend. Pickup	3,843	0	81	1,474
Hyperbolic Rend. Exchange	3,843	0	81	1,474

TABLE 2
PROPULSION STAGE CHARACTERISTICS

<u>STAGE TYPE</u>	<u>HYBRID</u>	<u>ALL- CRYO</u>	<u>NERVA</u>	<u>MER. ION</u>	<u>CES. ION</u>
Stage #1					
I _{sp}	468	468	825	3,000	20,000
A	0	0	11.5	*	*
B	0.0811	0.0811	0.15	0.1	0.1
M.R. O ₂ /Fuel	7	7	0	0	0
Stage #2					
I _{sp}	480	480	825	0	0
A	0	0	11.5	0	0
B	0.1765	0.1765	0.18	0	0
M.R. O ₂ /Fuel	7	7	0	0	0
Stage #3					
I _{sp}	370	480	825	0	0
A	0	0	11.5	0	0
B	0.0638	0.1765	0.18	0	0
M.R. O ₂ /Fuel	3.5	7	0	0	0

Stage inert weight = A + B x (Propellant wt.)
All masses in metric tons

A = Mass of power and propulsion system
B = Structure and tankage factor (dimensionless)

Note. For large chemical propulsion stages such as these, the weight of the engines and control systems can be included in the massless parameter B. This assumes the number and/or size of the engines increases with increased stage size so that a constant thrust to weight is maintained.

* For electric propulsion, A = (power parameter + power proc. & thruster parameter) x (electric power). The power processing and thruster mass parameter used for all cases was 10 kg/kw. An overall conversion efficiency of .7 was used for all cases. The power parameter as a function of total power is shown below:

Power, kw	200	600	1,000	3,000	6,000
electric delivered					
Power parameter					
kg/kw	40	30	15	10	10

TABLE 3
WEIGHT IN LEO AS A FUNCTION OF PAYLOAD
TO MARS AND MM ALL RETURNED

Wt. in LEO = A - B x (lander & Mars-OTV) + (C x MM)

	PARAMETERS	A	B	C
Conjunction Missions	Hybrid	A = 0	B = 3.94	C = 8.28
	Cryo	A = 0	B = 3.94	C = 7.56
	Nerva	A = 86	B = 2.25	C = 3.26
1999 Opposition	Hybrid	A = 0	B = 6.42	C = 35.73
	Cryo	A = 0	B = 6.42	C = 31.94
	Nerva	A = 140	B = 2.97	C = 6.93
2001 Opposition	Hybrid	A = 0	B = 4.07	C = 19.06
	Cryo	A = 0	B = 4.07	C = 16.92
	Nerva	A = 105	B = 2.3	C = 4.93
2005 Opposition	Hybrid	A = 0	B = 7.93	C = 18.96
	Cryo	A = 0	B = 7.93	C = 17.14
	Nerva	A = 100	B = 3.32	C = 5.12

A = Parameter relating required LEO weight to NERVA systems weight.

B = Parameter relating required LEO weight for systems carried one way to Mars.

C = Parameter relating required LEO weight for systems carried on round trip to Mars.

Figure 1
BASELINE MISSIONS




Figure 2
EFFECT OF DISCARDING MMM
50% OF MMM DISCARDED




Figure 3
AEROBRAKE TO 24 HR MARS ORBIT
 Hybrid Propulsion System (2 Stage)




Figure 4
WT TO LEO VS AEROBRAKE
 Hybrid Propulsion System




Figure 5

WT TO LEO VS AEROBRAKE

NERVA Propulsion System




Figure 6

WT. IN LEO VS. INCREASE IN LANDER WT.

Hybrid Propulsion System




Figure 7

WT. IN LEO VS. INCREASE IN LANDER WT.




Figure 8

WT. IN LEO VS. INCREASE IN LANDER WT.




Figure 9

WT. IN LEO VS. INCREASE IN MMM WT.

Hybrid Propulsion System




Figure 10

WT. IN LEO VS. INCREASE IN MMM WT.

All-Cryo Propulsion System




Figure 11

WT. IN LEO VS. INCREASE IN MMM WT.

Nerva Propulsion System




Figure 12

AEROBRAKING COMPARISON

Hybrid Propulsion System




Figure 13 AEROBRAKING COMPARISON




Figure 14 APPROXIMATE CREW TIME VS. POWER




Figure 15
INITIAL LEO MASS VS. POWER SUPPLY
53 MT Mission Module Carried Round Trip





Figure 16
COMPARISON WITH HYPERBOLIC RENDEZVOUS
Hybrid Propulsion System



INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE NASA SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY AUTHORIZATION (DAA) FORM

The DAA Form, or its equivalent, is used to prescribe the availability and distribution of all NASA-generated and NASA-funded documents containing scientific and technical information. Either a suitable description (title, abstract, etc.) of the document or a completed copy must accompany this form. This form requires an appropriate Program Office review and approval, and in some cases, an International Affairs Division review and approval. The Center Representative for Document Availability Authorization should forward the completed DAA to the NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility on completion. Specific guidelines for each Section follow:

- I. **Document/Project Identification:** Provide the information requested. If the document is classified, indicate security classification of the title and abstract. (Classified information must not be entered on this Form). Include RTOP numbers under the Contract number entry. Provide information on presentations or externally published documents as applicable. Documents intended for domestic presentation or publication must be approved in accordance with NASA STI Handbook (NHB 2200.2) while documents intended for presentation must also be screened. Documents that are to be printed as NASA series reports must be coordinated with the appropriate NASA installation or NASA Headquarters, Scientific and Technical Information Branch in accordance with NHB 2200.2. Note that information on the Report Documentation Page (if attached) is not to be entered here except for title, document date, and contract number.

- II. **Availability Category:** Check the appropriate category or categories.

Security Classification: Enter the applicable security classification for the document. Documents, if classified, will be available to all appropriately cleared personnel having a "need to know".

Export Controlled Document: If the document meets the provision of NHB 2200.2 Paragraph 5(g), the appropriate restriction must be checked, either International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) or Export Administration Regulations (EAR). This form must then be routed to the International Affairs Division for completion of Section VII. This category cannot be used with NASA Restricted Distribution documents.

NASA Restricted Distribution Document: If the document meets the provisions of NHB 2200.2, Paragraph 5(b), then the appropriate restriction must be checked, either "For Early Domestic Dissemination" (FEDD), or "Limited Distribution." If other special conditions apply to document availability, check the "Special Conditions" box and use Section III to determine the basis for such determination and the special handling required. This category cannot be used with Export Controlled Documents.

Document Disclosing an Invention: This box must be checked when documents contain information which discloses an invention. When this box is checked, an additional appropriate availability category must be checked. Authorization for use of this category must be provided by Installation Patent Counsel in Section IX.

Publicly Available Document: Check this box if the document is to be made available to the general public without restrictions. If this box is checked please indicate whether the document is copyrighted or not according to paragraph 203.2a in NHB 2200.2.

- III. **Special Conditions:** These boxes are checked only when the box designated "Special Conditions" in Section II has been checked. Both (a) and (b) are to be completed.

This subsection (a) describes the information content:

Foreign government information: Information provided by foreign governments under special agreements or the results of jointly sponsored research and development with agreed to limitations.

Commercial product test or evaluation results: Information resulting from the testing and/or evaluation of commercial products or processes that may unduly affect them if published.

Preliminary information: Preliminary or incomplete results, studies or recommendations for which wider distribution would be premature.

Special contract provisions: Information developed under NASA contracts that contain provisions providing limited rights to the data generated.

Other: Information that should be restricted for other reasons. The specific reason must be entered after "Other".

This subsection (b) on limitations refers to the user groups authorized to obtain the document. The special limitations apply both to the initial distribution of the documents and the the handling of requests for the documents. The limitations will appear on and apply to reproduced copies of the document. Documents limited to NASA personnel should not be made available to on-site contractors. If approval of the issuing office is checked, the NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility will provide only bibliographic processing and no initial distribution; the Facility will refer all document requests to the issuing office.

- IV. **Blanket Release:** This optional Section is to be completed whenever subsequent documents produced under the contract, grant or project are to be given the same distribution and/or availability as described in Section II. More than one contract number or RTOP Number can be entered. This Section may also be used to rescind or modify an earlier Blanket Release. All blanket releases must be approved by the Program Office (or its designee) and the International Affairs Division (if applicable), and concurred in by the Office of Management.

- V. **Project Officer/Technical Monitor:** The Project Officer or Technical Monitor should sign and date the form. The office code and typed name should be entered. The date signed should reflect the submission date to the program office whose approval will be entered in Section VI.

- VI. **Program Office Review:** This Section is to be completed by the duly authorized official representing the Program Office. Any delegation from NASA Headquarters to Field Installations in accordance with NHB 2200.2 should be entered here.

- VII. **International Affairs Division Review:** This Section is to be completed by the authorized representative of the International Affairs Division for all documents intended to be Export Controlled, for foreign publications or presentations, and for open domestic conference presentations.

- VIII. **Expiration of Review Time:** NHB 2200.2 provides twenty days for Program Office and International Affairs Division review. If no review has been received within twenty days, the Technical Monitor or Project Officer may release the document as marked in Section II. This release cannot be used for Export Controlled Documents, Conference presentations, or foreign publications.

- IX. **Document Disclosing an Invention:** In part a of this Section, the Installation Patent Counsel or the Intellectual Property Counsel may release a document in a time frame other than six months by entering the date and signing the alternate release. The NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility will process and distribute these documents after six months in accordance with Sections II and III unless otherwise notified.

- X. **Disposition:** This form, when completed, is to be sent to the NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility, P.O. Box 8757, B.W.I. Airport, Maryland 21240. When available, a printed or reproducible copy of the document should be sent with the form; otherwise, an abstract or Report Documentation Page should be sent. Forms that contain availability categories that have been disapproved by the Program Office or the International Affairs Division may be returned to the initiating NASA Technical Monitor or Project Office for resubmission.